

**REMARKS**

The application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated January 22, 2003. Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-20 were pending in this application. By the present Amendment, claims 6 and 7 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 9, and 15 have been amended to place the claims in better form for examination. Claims 8 and 14 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 1-5, 9-13 and 15-20, with claims 1, 9 and 15 being in independent form, are now presented for examination in this application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,323,490 to Ikeda et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,029 to Yamada et al. Dependent claims 4, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ikeda and Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,303 to Yamane et al. Dependent claims 11, 13, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ikeda and Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,379,336 to Kramer et al.

Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9 and 15, as amended, are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the variable power supply is set to 3.0 to 1.5 kV, said setting keeping the imaging device both below saturation and at a signal-to-noise ratio of at least 50. Thus, the pertinent parameters are recited as properties of the variable power supply and the panel rather than as a desired function

in the operation of the panel.

Applicants do not find a teaching or suggestion in the applied prior art of an imaging device with the recited variable power supply. As the Office Action acknowledges, *Ikeda* does not specifically identify the criteria used to determine the selected voltage. *Yamada*, like *Ikeda*, fails to disclose or suggest an imaging device with such a power supply. The portion of *Yamada* referred to in the Office Action, column 9, lines 9-18, does not disclose either voltage levels or a signal-to-noise ratio level. As the Office Action points out, *Yamada* refers in Fig. 3 to using 1 kV to 1.7 kV in the prior art, but does not teach or suggest a power supply set to keep a signal-to-noise ratio at least at 50 while keeping the imaging device below saturation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that an imaging device with a power supply that (1) supplies the numerical voltage range specified in the amended claims, (2) maintains the imaging device below saturation, and (3) keeps the signal-to-noise ratio at least at 50, is not taught or suggested by the applied references, but is a significant improvement in the relevant technology.

Applicant also have amended method claim 9 to clarify that the claimed method maintains a signal-to-noise ratio of at least 50 while supplying 3.0 kV to 1.5 kV between the top electrode layer and the readout matrix and maintaining the imaging device below saturation. No method with those specific parameters is taught in the applied references. Even if relevant parameters of the applied references could be adjusted to carry out the method of amended claim 9 (and this is not admitted), this is not sufficient to make claim 9 obvious because the references do not suggest doing so, and the unspecified

values of the relevant parameters could be adjusted to a virtually unlimited number of combinations of voltage levels, saturation levels and signal-to-noise ratio levels.

Applicants respectfully traverse the suggestion that the structure of Fig. 3 in *Ikeda* is substantially identical to that disclosed in this application. In connection with this Figure, *Ikeda* refers at column 2, lines 31-32 to a 1995 publication by a co-worker of the inventors here. The two devices are not identical. The 2001 *Ikeda* patent application describes and claims an improvement over the 1995 device.

The remaining independent claim, 15, also is a method claim and recites the combination of (1) providing a signal-to-noise ratio of at least 50, (2) operating below saturation, and (3) varying the voltage to achieve these parameters. As earlier discussed, the applied prior art does not teach or suggest such a method.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9 and 15, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an additional extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Rodricks, et al., S.N. 09/884,810  
Page 11

Dkt. 1166/68191

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

PAUL TENG, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicants  
Cooper & Durham LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, N.Y. 10036  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400